

# **2006 (7<sup>TH</sup>) SALMON APPLICATION FORMS**

**NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS  
(ASSESSMENTS & STUDIES)  
(ACQUISITION & ASSESSMENT)**

**18i**

**NE 19, 2006**

**FOR USE IN THE 2006 GRANT CYCLE  
ONLY**

## Application Authorization Memorandum

Each organization submitting a project must complete this form.

**TO:** Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)  
PO Box 40917  
Olympia, Washington 98504-0917

**THROUGH:** \_\_\_\_\_ **HOOD CANAL COORDINATING COUNCIL\_**  
(lead entity name)

**FROM:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SKOKOMISH INDIAN TRIBE** \_\_\_\_\_  
(applicant name)

Through the lead entity identified above, the SRFB is hereby requested to consider this application for financial assistance for the Salmon Recovery project(s) described below and to grant funding from such State and Federal sources as may be available. This application is prepared with knowledge of and in compliance with SRFB's policies and procedures. Further, we agree to cooperate with the SRFB by furnishing such additional information as may be necessary to execute a SRFB Project Agreement and to adhere to all appropriate state and federal statutes governing grant monies under the Project Agreement. We are aware that the grant, if approved, is paid on a reimbursement basis. We agree that all application materials, including photos, slides, site drawings, maps, etc., become the property of IAC/SRFB and may be used by IAC/SRFB for education, information, or other non-commercial purposes in publications, presentations or on the IAC/SRFB web site.

**Project Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_ **QUILCENE WATERSHED BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT**  
**FOR PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT / LAND ACQUISITION** \_\_\_\_\_

(Attach list \_\_\_\_\_  
if necessary) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

I/we certify that to the best of our knowledge, the data in this application is true and correct. In addition, I/we certify that the matching resources identified in the grant are committed to the above project. I/we acknowledge responsibility for supporting all non-cash commitments and donations should they not materialize.

**Authorized Representative:** \_\_\_\_\_ / S/ \_\_\_\_\_ August 10, 2006 \_\_\_\_\_  
(signature) (date)

Printed Name and Title: **\_Keith Dublanica - Tribal Natural Resources Director**

## 1. General Application Information

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 1)

Project Name

Project Type (check one)

- ☐ **Non-Capital** (assessments and studies)  
☒ **Planning and Acquisition** (assessment and acquisition)

## 2. Applicant / Organization Information

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 1 – SEARCH FOR ORGANIZATION)

Organization Name **SKOKOMISH INDIAN TRIBE**

Organization Type (check one)

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> City/Town             | <input type="checkbox"/> County                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Landowner       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation District | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American Tribe | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-profit Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RFEG                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Purpose District         | <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency            |

Organization Address **SKOKOMISH INDIAN TRIBE, NATURAL RESOURCES DEPT.**

Address **NORTH 533 TRIBAL CENTER ROAD**

City/Town **SKOKOMISH NATION**

State, Zip **WA 98584**

Telephone # **360 877 2110 X457** FAX # **360 877 2113**

Internet e-mail address [keith@skokomish.org](mailto:keith@skokomish.org) Web site URL **www.skokomish.org**

## 3. Project Contact Information

Complete one for each contact.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 1 – SEARCH FOR PERSON)

☒ Mr. ☐ Ms. Title

First Name **Keith**

Last Name **Dublanica**

☒ Primary Contact OR

**Marty Ereth** ☒ Alternate Contact

Contact Mailing Address **Skokomish Tribe's Natural Resources Department**

Address **N. 533 Tribal Center Road**

Work Telephone # **360 877 2110 x457**

City/Town **Skokomish Nation**

FAX # **360 877 2113**

State, Zip **WA 98584**

Internet e-mail address [keith@skokomish.org](mailto:keith@skokomish.org)

## 4. Goal and Objective Non-Capital Projects

Select one goal and one objective that best fits your project  
and respond to all of the measurements for that goal and objective.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 2)

<b>Goal:</b> The goal of the project is to increase and/or maintain adequate flows for wild salmon. (No measurements for this goal).  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to reduce over appropriation of water in salmon bearing streams.	X
<b>Goal:</b> The goal of the project is to increase and improve information to help select projects that have a high certainty and benefit.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to determine project siting, feasibility, design, or implementation.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to fill data gaps identified in the lead entity strategy.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to fill data gaps regarding fish barriers.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to fill data gaps regarding limiting factors and scientific studies.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to fill data gaps regarding marine nearshore assessments.  <b>Objective:</b> The objective of the project is to identify locations where derelict gear are a source of salmon mortality.	X  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/>

## 5. Measurement Information

RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING MEASUREMENTS

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 6)

<b>Measurement:</b> Plan/assessment has been used to guide restoration actions	X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Measurement:</b> Plan/assessment identifies necessary actions needed to meet goals.	X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Measurement:</b> Plan/assessment identifies/prioritizes factors limiting production.	X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Measurement:</b> Plan/assessment incorporates biological goals.	X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Measurement:</b> Length of streambank protected through land acquisition/easement/lease. (If both sides, add lengths).	<b>Potential. 4.2 Miles</b>

## 6. Short Description of Project

Describe project, what will be done, and what the anticipated benefits will be in 1500 characters or less.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 2)

**NOTE:** Many audiences, including the SRFB, SRFB's Technical Review Panel, media, legislators, and the public who may inquire about your project use this description. Provide as clear, succinct and descriptive an overview of your project as possible – many will read these 1-2 paragraphs!

The description should state what is proposed. Identify the specific problems that will be addressed by this project, and why it is important to do at this time. Describe how, and to what extent, the project will protect, restore or address salmon habitat. Describe the general location, geographic scope, and targeted species/stock. This short description should be the summary of the detailed proposal set out under Evaluation Proposal, with particular emphasis on questions I-IV.

*The database limits this space to 1500 characters (including spaces); any excess text will be deleted.*

This project secures a Big Quilcene River “reach -wide biological assessment”, that will support a multi-agency programmatic agreement for restoration activities from the federal Quilcene Fish Hatchery to the river mouth. This project also supports property acquisition in the Quilcene watershed identified as critical for conservancy purposes. The Skokomish Tribe has worked cooperatively to improve habitat in this watershed, an area within the Treaty-defined usual and accustomed area of the Tribe. SRFB funded a 2004 “Quilcene River Reach Analysis and Restoration Feasibility Study” prepared by Herrera Consultants. The analysis determined the “study reach” had incised, disconnecting it from the floodplain. Recommended restoration included construction of a series of engineered grade controls, jam complexes and bank protection jams in the “restoration reach” in a phased fashion, improve on-site channel conditions, and begin the process of coarse sediment retention and floodplain integrity. The Tribe installed pilot log structures in 2002 and 2003, including a grade control and a bar structure intended to divert high flows towards a relict side channel on the north bank, and acquired 15 acres of floodplain, an area utilized by Hood Canal summer chum salmon. The Tribe has since purchased an adjacent 15 acres. The Tribe was awarded 2005 SRFB funds to implement elements identified in the study. This project is the logical step forward in a longer reach- wide assessment.

## 7. Summary of Funding Request and Match Contribution

Remember to update this section whenever changes  
are made to your cost estimates.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 3)

### TOTAL PROJECT COST (A + B)

(Sponsor Match & SRFB Contribution)

\$ 81,214

### A. Sponsor Match Contribution (15% minimum is required for match)

Appropriation/Cash \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Bonds - Council \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Bonds - Voter \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Cash Donations \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Conservation Futures \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Donations

    Donated Equipment \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Donated Labor \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Donated Land \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Donated Materials \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Donated Property Interest \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Force Account

    Force Acct - Equipment \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Force Acct - Labor \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Force Acct - Material \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Grants\*

    Grant - Federal \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Grant - Local \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Grant - Private \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Grant - State \$ \_\_\_\_\_

    Grant - IAC \$ 18,000

    Grant - Other \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Sponsor Match Contribution**

\$ 18,000

15% Minimum Match Required  
of A. TOTAL PROJECT COST

**B. SRFB Contribution (grant request)**

\$ 63,214

\$5,000 Minimum Request

**\*Note, be sure to identify the name and type of any matching grant in the  
Application Questionnaire Section.**

--

## 8. Property Acquisition Cost Estimate

ACQUISITION includes the purchase of land in fee title, or lesser interests such as conservation easements or other property rights. Conservation easements must be in perpetuity. The acquisition policy is set out in Manual #3, located on IAC Web Page <http://www.iac.wa.gov/srfb/docs.htm>. Use this form for combination (planning and acquisition) projects only. **(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 4)**

	Property	Property	Property	Total Properties
<b>Property Name</b>	<i>PUD #1</i>			Leave shaded
<b>Date to be Acquired</b>	<i>12/2006</i>			areas blank
<b>Acreage to be Acquired</b>	<i>5</i>			
<b>VALUE DETERMINATION TYPE</b> (Check one for each property)				
Appraised/reviewed value	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Estimate of value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Letter of opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>PURCHASE TYPE</b> (Check one for each property)				
Fee ownership (land/improvements)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Less than fee ownership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>ACQUISITION COST ITEMS</b> (Complete all that apply)				
Applicable taxes	<i>1500</i>			
Appraisal and review	<i>400</i>			
Baseline inventory				
Closing	<i>1,000</i>			
Demolition				
Easement – access				
Easement – trail				
Fencing				
Hazardous substances assessment				
Improvements & structures				
Land	<i>35,000</i>			
Noxious weed control				
Recording fees	<i>130</i>			
Relocation				
Rights – agriculture				
Rights – development				
Rights – mineral				
Rights – other				
Rights – timber				
Rights – water				
Signing				
Survey	<i>2500</i>			
Title reports/insurance	<i>350</i>			
Wetland delineation				
<b>Column Sub-Total</b>	<i>40,880</i>			
<b>Admin Costs (5% of Sub-Total)</b>	<i>2,044</i>			
<b>TOTAL ACQUISITION COSTS</b>	<i>42924</i>			

## 9. Assessment and Studies Project Cost Estimate

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 5)

ASSESSMENTS AND STUDIES may include feasibility studies; channel migration studies; reach-level, near-shore, and estuarine assessments; and inventories such as barrier, unscreened water diversions; and landslide hazard. A feasibility study could include assessing the willingness of landowners to agree to allow access to their land for a habitat project or to consider selling a conservation easement. The results of proposed assessments must directly lead to identification, siting, or design of habitat protection or restoration projects or fill a data gap identified as a priority in a lead entity strategy.

**Complete only items that apply to your project.**  
**TOTAL COST must include the SRFB and Sponsor's Match Contribution.**  
*Use only whole dollar amounts.*

Item	Unit	Qty.	Total Cost	Description Needed	Description (60 characters max.)
<b>Communications</b>					
Advertising	Lump sum			Optional	
Communications – other	Lump sum			Optional	
Postage	Lump sum			Optional	
Printing, binding, copying	Lump sum			Optional	
Telephone	Lump sum			Optional	
<b>Equipment</b>					
Equipment – other	Lump sum			Describe	
<b>Insurance</b>					
Insurance – other	Lump sum			Describe	
Liability insurance	Lump sum			To/From	
<b>Permits</b>					
Permits	Lump sum			Optional	THIS PROJECT SUPPORTS A REACH-WIDE BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND MULTI-AGENCY PERMIT
<b>Professional Services</b>					
Consultant(s)	Lump sum		22,500	Optional	
Mapping/GIS	Lump sum		2,500	Optional	
Photography	Lump sum		1,250	Optional	
Professional services – other	Lump sum		1,600	Optional	
Surveying	Lump sum		1,500	Optional	
<b>Rentals &amp; Leases</b>					
Meeting rooms	Lump sum			Optional	
Rentals & leases – other	Lump sum			Describe	
Vehicle lease	Lump sum			Optional	

## Assessment and Studies Project Cost Estimate (Continued)

Item	Unit	Qty.	Total Cost	Description Needed	Description (60 characters max.)
<b>Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>					
Salaries & benefits - other	# of FTE's	.10	8,500	Title	Restoration specialist
Salaries & benefits - other	# of FTE's			Title	
<b>Supplies</b>					
Computer software	Lump sum			Describe	
Forms, maps, stationery	Lump sum			Optional	
General supplies	Lump sum			Optional	
Publications	Lump sum			Optional	
<b>Transportation/Travel</b>					
Mileage	Rate	.44	440	Miles	App. 1000 miles of travel
Per diem	Each			Optional	
Transportation/travel – other	Lump sum			Describe	
Vehicle use	Rate / month			Optional	
<b>Sales Tax</b>					
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>			<b>\$38,290</b>		

### 10a. Application Questionnaire

All applicants must answer the following questions.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 8)

#### Cost Efficiencies

For any grants listed in the Summary of Funding Request and Match Contribution Section, are there any restrictions on the use of these grant funds? When and how long will the grant funds be available to this project?

Describe the type of donated labor (skilled and unskilled), donated equipment, and donated materials that will be used for this project, identified in the Summary of Funding Request and Match Contribution Section.

#### Land Ownership

What type of landowner currently owns the property? (Federal, Local, Private, State or Tribal.)  
**Varied ownership of area to be considered within a 'reach-wide' biological assessment area includes county, private and Tribal ownership of landscapes.**

What is the current land use of the site, and its history? Describe past human uses and salmon habitat functions.

### Worksite Location Data

What are the geographic coordinates of the work site(s) (in degrees, minutes and seconds)? [If you do not have them, you may leave this question blank.]

What is the township/range/section of the work site(s)?

**T27N, 2W, Section 23**

In what county(s) is the work site(s) located? In what city, if applicable? **Jefferson County**

In what Water Resource Inventory Area(s) (WRIA) is the work site located? (Provide WRIA name and WRIA number.) **WRIA-17**

Is the work site on a stream and/or other waterbody? If yes, name the stream and/or waterbody. If the stream is a tributary of a larger stream, also name the larger stream. If you know the river mile, list it here. **Big Quilcene River, RM 0.0 to RM 4.2**

Is your work site(s) located within estuarine or saltwater habitat? If so, name it. How close is it to fresh water systems? Name any other estuary or habitat adjacent to this site.

**yes - Quilcene Bay**

Is the work site(s) located within a park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site? If yes, name the area. **No**

### 10b. Application Questionnaire

**Combined Projects must answer the following questions.**

Will the property proposed for acquisition involve future restoration? If yes, explain how and when restoration will occur. **Proposed land will be identified for conservancy protection while incorporating certain apex bar jam and large woody debris installations, within two (2) calendar years of SRFBD funding approval.**

### 10c. Application Questionnaire

**Non-profit organizations must answer the following questions.**

Is your organization registered as a non-profit with the Washington Secretary of State? If so, what is your Unified Business Identifier (UBI) number?

What date was your organization created?

**The Skokomish Indian Tribe was created following the January 16, 1855 Treaty of Point No Point. The Tribe is the successor to the Tua'duq or Twana people.**

How long has your organization been involved in salmon and habitat conservation?

**...since time immemorial.**

### 11. Work Site Information

**(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 9)**

Driving Directions (provide directions that will enable staff to locate the project):

**Drive North on Hwy 101 from Shelton. Cross over the Quilcene River and continue on another 1.5 miles to Glen Logie Road. Turn right onto Glen Logie Road and immediately to the right, is a locked gate accessing the Glen Logie Ranch (Baclawski-Workman property). Alternatively, park at the Highway 101 bridge and walk down the north side of the river along the WDFW easement until you reach the site, approximately ¼ mile downstream.**

Current Landowner(s) of the site (name and address). Remember to complete the Landowner Willingness Form.

## 12. Permits

Check the appropriate boxes to indicate required and/or anticipated permits.  
General permit information can be obtained at the Dept. of Ecology Permit Assistance Center  
1-800-917-0043 or on their Internet site  
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/pac/index.html>.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 10)

Permits	Comments Regarding Permit Status
<input type="checkbox"/> Aquatic Lands Use Authorization (Dept of Natural Resources)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Building Permit (City/County)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Assessment [Section 106] (CTED-OAHP)	The Skokomish Tribal Historic Preservation Officer will provide the appropriate assessments.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dredge/Fill Permit [Section 10/404 or 404] (US Army Corps of Engineers)	Installation of channel structures has been determined to be fill and as such will be addressed in the programmatic permit agreement proposed.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Endangered Species Act Compliance [ESA] (US Fish & Wildlife/NMFS)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Practices Application [Forest & Fish] (Dept of Natural Resources)	There may be certain forest practices involving site trees to be used in their entirety as habitat
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Permit (Dept of Health/County)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA] (Dept of Fish & Wildlife)	An HPA may be anticipated, incorporated in the programmatic permit proposed
<input type="checkbox"/> NEPA (Federal Agencies)	
<input type="checkbox"/> SEPA (Local or State Agencies)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline Permit (City/County)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Certification [Section 401] (County/Dept of Ecology)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Water Rights/Well Drilling Permit (Dept of Ecology)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Required Permits (identify)	the goal of this submission is to develop a programmatic permit with biological assessment

### 13. Salmonid Species Information

Identify one or more targeted Salmonid species (directly on-site, indirectly downstream or within the rearing/migration corridor) whose habitat conditions you are attempting to improve or protect. Select one Primary Species.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 11)

Salmonid Species	Species Targeted (select as many as apply)	Primary Species (select only one)
Bull Trout	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chinook	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chum – Hood Canal summer	X	X
Coho	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cutthroat	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pink	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sockeye	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Steelhead	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 14a. Habitat Factors Addressed

Identify one or more Habitat Factors being addressed by this Project and select one Primary Factor.

For definitions of Habitat Factors, see Manual 18b, Appendix B.

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 11)

Habitat Factors	Project Addresses (select as many as apply)	Primary Factor (select only one)
1. Biological Processes	x	X
2. Channel Conditions	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Estuarine and Near-shore Habitat	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Floodplain Conditions	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Lake Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Loss of Access to Spawning and Rearing Habitat	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Riparian Conditions	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Streambed Sediment Conditions	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Water Quality	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Water Quantity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 14b. Species/Habitat Factors Information Sources

For Species Information provide the source and indicate if the species listed are directly on-site

at some point in their life stage (i.e. SaSI, WDFW Stream Catalog, Stream Survey/Field Observation, Limiting Factors Distribution Maps).

For Habitat Factors Information list the study/report and date identifying the habitat factors for your project (i.e. SaSI, limiting factors analysis, watershed analysis, other assessments or studies).

(ENTER ON PRISM TAB 11)

Study Name	Author	Date
Hood Canal Summer Chum Recovery Plan		
Big Quilcene River Feasibility	Herrera Env. Consultants	December 2004

## 15. Evaluation Proposal

Applicants must respond to the following items. The local citizen and technical advisory groups will use the evaluation proposal to evaluate your project. Applicants should contact their lead entity for additional information that may be required.

*Up to eight pages may be submitted for each project evaluation proposal.*

(SUBMIT INFORMATION VIA PRISM ATTACHMENT PROCESS OR ON PAPER)

### I. BACKGROUND

Describe the fish resources, the current habitat conditions, and other current and historic factors important to understanding this project. Be specific—avoid general statements. When possible, document your sources of information by citing specific studies and reports.

The Big Quilcene River located in Jefferson County in the Quilcene-Snow Water Resource Area (WRIA) 17, drains a 70 square mile area and flows into Quilcene Bay near Quilcene in the northwest arm of Hood Canal. The headwaters begin in the Olympic National Park and the Buckhorn Wilderness Area at about 5,600 feet elevation and have steep gradients and confined channels. The watershed is primarily forested with small hobby farms and residential development in the lower 3.5 miles. At about river mile (RM) 4.0, the river flows out of a bedrock canyon where the valley widens and the channel consists of a low gradient alluvial bed.

Most of the watershed has been logged at some time beginning in the 1920's and peaked in the 1960's through 1980's. Given the steep nature of the watershed, mass wasting, debris torrents and snow avalanches are common. The Big Quilcene has two major water diversions, one at RM. 9.3 operated by the City of Port Townsend on USFS land and the other at RM 2.8 operated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Quilcene National Fish Hatchery. Low flows are a common problem in the Quilcene River and in WRIA 17 in general because of low annual rainfall.

Anadromous fish resources found in the Quilcene River include summer chum listed at "*threatened*" under the Endangered Species Act, fall chum, coho, winter steelhead and sea-run cutthroat. Fall chum are considered healthy and coho are depressed. Stock status for winter steelhead and cutthroat are basically unknown (WDFW/Western Washington Indian Tribes 1994). Resident trout also inhabit the upper reaches of the Big Quilcene and tributary streams. A man-made fish passage barrier (USFWS hatchery electric weir) is present at RM 2.8 virtually stopping all upstream passage of adult salmon. Another fish passage barrier exists at the confluence of Penny Creek, a right bank tributary to the Big Quilcene and historically thought to be an important salmon habitat. Other than a few small tributary streams draining Mt. Walker, there are no significant tributary streams available to anadromous fish in the basin (WCC 2002).

The entire floodplain has been logged of the original forest. Much of the floodplain in the lower 3 miles has been altered by the use of levees, groins, rip rap and mechanical means. From about RM 2.6 downstream to RM 2.0, much of the floodplain is disconnected from the main river, restricted by levels and bank armoring and a diagonal rock berm (Herrera 2004, Jefferson County 1998, WCC 2002, WDFW/PNPTC 2000 Randy Johnson (WDFW), personal communication). In the lower 1 mile of the river, diking, armoring and dredging have occurred for flood protection measures. Despite the efforts, extensive channel aggradation has increased the streambed elevation by 2 to 7 feet between 1971 and 1993 and has extended the river mouth into Quilcene Bay approximately 1,700 feet (WCC 2002, Randy Johnson (WDFW), personal communication). Recently some of the dikes on the north side of the Quilcene in the lower reach below Linger Longer Road have been removed connecting the river once again with the historic floodplain.

The Skokomish Tribe was awarded a SRFB grant in 2002 for a reach analysis and feasibility study in the Big Quilcene River from RM 1.8 to RM 2.7. Although much of this reach is incised and simplified it has exhibited a much more complex channel in the past as indicated from air photo analysis of channel alignments since 1939. For this reason the December 2004 Herrera report identified that significant restoration activities could be conducted in the reach between RM 2.04 and 2.37 on the Baclawski and Workman property.

The restoration of aquatic habitat in the lower Big Quilcene River, including side channel development, riparian reforestation and channel complexity enhancement (pools, log jams) is likely the best use of resources to revive salmonid populations in the Big Quilcene River (USFS/DNR 1994). The 2005 funds awarded support for the above structures. This proposal is the logical step in continuing a longer reach-wide biological assessment, that supports a programmatic agreement for restoration purposes, that addresses landscape protective mechanisms for downstream properties at risk from development.

## **II. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

**Describe what habitat conditions and habitat-forming processes will be assessed and how that will improve our understanding of salmonid use or habitat needs. All projects should state the nature, source, and extent of the altered conditions that this project will address or help understand. Address the primary causes of the problem, not just the symptoms. Document your sources of supporting information by citing specific studies, reports, or other documentation.**

Because of past logging and anthropogenic manipulation of the river within the study reach, the river channel has become incised and the river has become disconnected from most of its floodplain and secondary channels. Between RM 2.7 and RM 1.8, the Big Quilcene River has changed in form and dimensions over the last 6 decades. The historical trend in this reach is toward a less sinuous (straightened) channel. At RM 2.6 and 2.2, the channel is restricted by levees and bank armoring and is 130 to 165 feet narrower at these locations than in the past. The narrowing of the channel is likely a primary cause of channel bed incision in the restoration reach. Incision has disconnected the river from the floodplain, reduced the extent to which side channels in the reach become activated and impedes wood and spawning gravel recruitment, all resulting in less favorable habitat conditions for successful spawning and rearing of salmon.

Within this reach, the riparian forest on the south side of the river although not mature, is intact and made up of deciduous and conifer trees. The riparian forest on the north side consists of primarily deciduous trees and is narrow, not capable of supplying adequate amounts of coarse woody debris in the near term. In the 1980's the land was logged and topsoil was removed from the land near the river resulting in low recruitment potential and poor soils for restoring riparian vegetation.

There has been some question regarding the recruitment of woody debris and sediment from upstream sources which may be impeded by the USFWS Quilcene National Fish Hatchery concrete diversion weir. However, recent discussions with hatchery staff regarding hatchery weir maintenance suggests this is not the case anymore. Hatchery staff attempt to allow wood and sediment to pass freely downstream (Larry Tellas personal communication).

Poor channel conditions within the project reach result in less woody debris recruitment such that wood that is routed into the reach, often continues downstream to where the channel exhibits more complexity and sinuosity. The lack of woody debris recruitment into the project reach in turn, further exacerbates the poor channel conditions. Within the study reach, only 23 pieces of large woody debris (LWD) were encountered and mapped during the 2002-2003 field investigations for the feasibility analysis. Most of the LWD is of deciduous tree species, which is directly related to the high percentage of deciduous trees along the banks of the study reach. The study reach does not meet LWD frequency standards and therefore is not properly functioning as fish habitat (NMFS 1996, USFWS 1998).

A total of 22 pools were identified in the study reach with most of them rated relatively low for habitat quality (Platts et al. 1987). On a pool quality index scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest rating), one pool was rated 1, seventeen pools rated 2 and only 3 pools rated as high as 3. The low pool ratings are attributed to narrow width, shallow depth and/or lack of cover for fish. The study reach does not meet the pool frequency standards and therefore is not properly functioning as fish habitat (NMFS 1996, USFWS 1998).

Two pilot log jams were constructed by the Skokomish Tribe within the reach in 2002 and 2003 to slow velocities promoting aggradation, form pools and to provide cover for fish. After one year, early signs of aggradation were observed around ELJ1 and the pool formed below ELJ1 had a habitat quality rating of 3. This pool will likely deepen over time increasing its habitat quality. Likewise over time and multiple high flow events, a large pool will likely form at the front of ELJ2. Racked wood and rootwads associated with the jam will provide cover and capture additional wood (Herrera 2002). Most of the side channels are dry with the study reach, and appear to convey flows only during peak flow events. However, juvenile coho salmon have been observed in isolated pools in the side channels (Marty Erth personal observation). Nevertheless, these primarily seasonal side channels dewater and most of the fish probably perish.

The biological assessment will address aspects of the flood plain roughly between the river mouth and Highway 101

### **III. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

List the project's objectives. Objectives are statements of specific outcomes that typically can be measured or quantified over time. Objectives are more specific than goals (visions of the desired future condition) and less specific than tasks (the specific steps that would be taken to accomplish each of the objectives). For example, the objectives of an assessment might be to determine project siting, feasibility, and design. Explain how achieving the objectives will address and help solve the problem identified in II above.

The area of proposed habitat restoration (RM 2.04 to 2.37) is owned by Mark Baclawski and Gail Workman, the Skokomish Indian Tribe and Jefferson County Public Utility District #1.. The main goal of this project is to address a longer "reach-wide biological assessment" that focuses improve floodplain connectivity and habitat diversity in a up[stream and downstream of the acquired properties, in manner(s) compatible with the land owners. Although the project is proposed for this reach, the feasibility analysis analyzed the effects of potential restoration actions on other properties upstream and downstream of the Baclawski-Workman and Tribal properties.

The feasibility analysis identified several restoration activities that could be done in phases. This proposal will expands upon several of the action items identified, including all of those in Phase I and portions of Phase IB and Phase II, specifically those increasing channel complexity and halting incision by constructing engineered log jams and grade control log jams that will slow velocities, capture sediment, increase channel complexity and activate existing side channels. Reconnecting the river with the floodplain will help reduce in channel velocities and reduce the continued incision the channel has been experiencing.

The long term goal is to create a channel that has the ability to access the floodplain and a mature riparian corridor, form Highway 101 downstream to the Quilcene River mouth, with abundant wood jams providing cover and channel complexity, spawning gravel entrainment and side channel enhancement, benefiting all life stages and species of salmon present in the Big Quilcene River, while protecting sensitive landscapes through acquisition(s).

#### IV. PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

- ▷ Briefly describe the geographic setting of the project (marine nearshore, estuary, main stem, tributary, etc.) and the life cycle stage(s) affected.
- ▷ List the individuals and methods used to identify the project and its location.
- ▷ Clearly state how the assessment design and methodology is adequate to answer the objective of the assessment.
- ▷ Explain how the results of the assessment will lead directly to projects that benefit salmonids or how the assessment fills a data gap identified as a priority in the lead entity's strategy.
- ▷ Describe the consequences of not conducting this project at this time. Explain why this project is imperative to do. For acquisition projects, also describe the current level and imminence of risk to habitat.
- ▷ Describe how the project design and methodology will be implemented.
  - Explain how the project's cost estimates were determined.
  - Describe other approaches and opportunities that were considered to achieve the project's objectives.
  - List project partners. When appropriate, include a letter from each participating partner briefly outlining its role and contribution to the project. (See Section 16 for a sample format.)
  - List all landowner names (if the assessment covers large stream reach or an entire subbasin, then the landowner willingness forms are not required). Include a signed form from each landowner acknowledging their property is proposed for SRFB funding consideration. (See Section 17 for a sample format.)
  - Describe how the assessment addresses the stages and elements in *Guidance on Watershed Assessment for Salmon* (Joint Natural Resources Cabinet, May 2001). See Manual 18b, Appendix E.
  - When known, identify the staff, consultants, and subcontractors that will be designing and implementing the project, including their names, qualifications, roles and responsibilities. If not yet known, describe the selection process.
  - For projects that have acquisition component: Briefly describe the extent to which habitat to be acquired is currently fully functioning and/or needs restoration; the timeframe in which responses or improvements in habitat functioning are expected; and the continuity of the proposed acquisition with other protected or functioning habitat in the reach.

The approach of the project builds off the phased approach as outlined in the Reach Analysis and Restoration Feasibility Study (Herrera 2002). The project was primarily located within the mainstem Big Quilcene River between RM 2.04 and 2.37, which currently possesses a plane bed channel morphology (Montgomery and Buffington 1997). This proposal is for a 'reach-wide biological assessment' and land acquisition.

All species and life stages present within the Big Quilcene River will be affected by the proposed project. Since summer chum are listed as "threatened" one could say we are targeting the migration, spawning and incubation life stages of summer chum salmon. However, successful project implementation will benefit all life stages of summer and fall chum, coho, steelhead and coastal cutthroat trout.

Skokomish Tribal staff along with local biologists involved in drafting the 2000 Summer Chum Conservation Initiative and the WRIA 17 Limiting Factors Analysis identified this area as a restoration need. The landowners, Mr. Baclawski and Ms. Workman are acquaintances of the Skokomish Tribes Director of Natural Resources, Keith Dublanica. Keith inquired about how receptive they would be in allowing restoration on their property and they were receptive. The Skokomish Tribe was awarded a 2002 SRFB grant to conduct a reach analysis and restoration feasibility study in this area. Herrera Environmental Consultants were awarded the contract. Tim Abbe and other staff with Herrera Environmental Consultants drafted the document and

identified appropriate project action items and recommended a possible phased approach to implement the actions.

It is timely that the 2005 restoration will occur with construction commencing in summer 2007. Due to the continued trend at this location towards further channel incision identified in the analysis (Herrera 2002), as well as threats of development in the local landscape. In addition, since the brood-stocking of summer chum salmon has been discontinued, the habitat needs to be capable of supporting naturally spawning summer chum salmon into the future without further hatchery intervention. The previous year's project's preliminary designs and cost estimates were identified in the Herrera report. Some adjustments were made where Skokomish Tribal staff felt that costs could be modified. The Skokomish Tribe is implementing the earlier projects with the approval of landowners.

This proposal for an assessment will require access to certain lands currently held by project cooperators, including the Tribe. Other project partners may include the Conservation District engineers and the PUD #1. Discussions with them are on-going so a "Project Partner Contribution Form" is not available at this time but is expected in the near future. A PUD #1 hearing specific to the opportunity to make the PUID#1 land surplus is scheduled for August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2006, so is timely with this submission.

Landowners Mark Baclawski and Gail Workman will be providing a signed "Landowner Willingness Form" as well as the Skokomish Tribe. Access to the sites, riparian enhancement and anticipated flooding of the floodplain will still need to have approval and signing off by the current landowners. An 'understanding of access' between the Tribe and Baclawski-Workman was signed August 11. (attached).

At this time, project identification and design has been performed by Herrera Environmental Consultants and a scope of work for the 'reach-wide biological assessment' is forthcoming, following recent discussions with the firm. Oversight of any future construction following the 2007 projects is expected to be carried out by a combination from the Tribe, Conservation District, and Herrera Environmental Consultants.

#### **IV. TASKS AND TIME SCHEDULE**

List and describe the major tasks and time schedule you will use to complete the project.

The Skokomish Tribe intends to apply for programmatic permits early on in the process and would accomplish the construction during the appropriate work window identified by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. The "reach-wide biological assessment" is expected to provide the groundwork and foundational support, for multi-agency review, and subsequent endorsement for future phases of riparian enhancement and restoration, assisting the securing of funds that are supplemental and complementary, as 'match' to SRFBD.

#### **V. CONSTRAINTS AND UNCERTAINTIES**

State any known constraints or uncertainties that may hinder successful completion of the project. Identify any possible problems, delays, or unanticipated expenses associated with project implementation. Explain how you will address these constraints.

The Herrera report identified two scenarios for grade controls within the channel. The first was using 3 foot high grade controls and the second using 4 foot high grade controls. Results of the HEC-RAS model run was then presented for each scenario and identified at 2 year and 100 year flood events. Under both the 3 and 4 foot grade control scenarios, there is little difference in flood inundation of the agricultural fields north of the river. However at the 100 year flood levels, the 4 foot grade control tends to flood much more of the property. Therefore the landowners are more comfortable with the 3 foot grade controls as opposed to the 4 foot controls. These types of similar assessments are appropriate for the downstream properties, and expanded reach-wide biological assessment.

Currently a fishing easement exists on the north side of the river beginning at the Highway 101 bridge and continues downstream past the Tribal, and Baclawski-Workman property. Although the easement was originally a Washington Department of Game easement for recreational winter steelhead fishing, the primary use is for recreational salmon fishing targeting coho salmon. Quilcene River coho are earlier than other Hood Canal coho stocks and managed as a hatchery stocks. However, they overlap with the summer chum stock as far as timing of river entry and spawning (September through mid October). There is intense fishing pressure on the surplus hatchery coho while summer chum are spawning and it has been identified as a potential conflict and discussions are on-going between the Skokomish Tribe and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and with the landowners to buy back portions or all of the easement. This sort of remedy could be an additional potential opportunity.

The Skokomish Tribe has secured the SW property which includes the active channel and timberlands south of the river. The Tribe also negotiated a purchase the southern part of the large parcel that includes some or all of the active river channel, forest land on the south bank as well as a small right bank tributary stream and it's confluence with the Quilcene River through an approved Jefferson County boundary line adjustment. (attached) completed July of this year. The 5-acre PUD #1 property is downstream of this project and the Herrera consultants have identified this as (attached) critical due to its spanning the river, having timber resources on the south bank and imminently at risk due to adjacent property development.

These and other similar landscape- based projects throughout the Hood Canal basin, help support the Treaty rights of the Skokomish Indian Tribe as identified in the 1855 Treaty of Point No Point, affirmed in US v. Washington, and celebrated in the Centennial Accord. Ecological restoration and cultural restoration are not mutually exclusive.

## REFERENCES

Herrera Environmental Consultants. 2004. Reach Analysis and Restoration Feasibility Study-Big Quilcene River, River Mile 1.8 to River Mile 2.7. Prepared for the Skokomish Tribe. Skokomish Nation, Washington.

Jefferson County. 1998. Lower Big Quilcene River Comprehensive Floodplain Management Plan. Jefferson County Department of Public Works, Port Townsend, Washington.

Keith Dublanica, Skokomish Director of Natural Resources personal communication

Larry Tellas (USFWS Quilcene National Fish Hatchery) personal communication.

Marty Ereth (personal observations)

Montgomery, D.R. and J.M. Buffington. 1997. Channel-Reach Morphology in Mountain Drainage Basins. Geologic Society of America Bulletin 109:596-611.

NOAA/NMFS. 1996. Making Endangered Species Act Determinations of Effect for Individual or Group Actions at the Watershed Scale. National Marine Fisheries Service, Environmental and Technical Services Division, Habitat Conservation Branch, Lacey, Washington.

Platts, W.S., C. Armour, G.D. Booth, M. Bryant, J.L. Bufford, P. Cuplin, S. Jensen, G.W. Lienkaemper, G.W. Minshall, S.B. Monsen, R.L. Nelson, J.R. Sedell and J.S. Tuhy. 1987. Methods for Evaluating Riparian Habitats with Applications to Management, General Technical Report INT-221. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station.

USFWS. 1998. A Framework to Assist Making Endangered Species Act Determinations of Effect for Individual or Grouped Actions at the Bull Trout Subpopulation Watershed Scale. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

USFS/DNR 1994. Big Quilcene Watershed Analysis- An ecological report at the watershed level. U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service, Olympic National Forest, Olympia, Washington.

Washington State Conservation Commission. 2002. Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Water Resource Inventory Area 17. Quilcene/Snow Watershed.

WDFW/PNPTC. 2000. Summer Chum Salmon Conservation Initiative. An Implementation Plan to Recover Summer Chum Salmon in Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca Region.

WDFW/Western Washington Indian Tribes. 1994 1992 Washington State Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory (SASSI). Appendix One, Puget Sound Stocks, Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca Volume.

Skokomish Tribal letter of access agreement to Mark Baclawski, July 2006

Jefferson County, approved and recorded Boundary Line Adjustment survey map, July 2006

Jefferson County PUD #1 flyer of August 16<sup>th</sup> hearing regarding property 'surplus' potential, July 2006.

Herrera Environmental Consultants' e-mail communication regarding Jefferson County PUD #1 property in Quilcene River, July 2006.

## 16. Project Partner Contribution Form

**Project Partner: Skokomish Indian Tribe**

Partner Address:

**Contact Person**

x Mr.      ☐ Ms.      Title: Skokomish Tribe's Natural Resources Director

First Name: Keith      Last Name: Dublanica

Contact Mailing Address: North 533 Tribal Center Road, Skokomish Nation WA 98584

Contact E-Mail Address: keith@skokomish.org

**Description of contribution to project:**

**Estimated value to be contributed: \$\_\_\_\_\_18,000\_\_\_\_\_**

**/S/**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Partner's signature

\_\_\_\_\_**8/14/06**\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## 17. Landowner Willingness Form

### Landowner Information:

**Name of Landowner:**

**Landowner Contact Information:**

☐ Mr.      ☐ Ms.      Title

First Name:      Last Name:

Contact Mailing Address:

Contact E-Mail Address:

**Property Address or Location:**

I certify that \_\_\_\_\_ is the legal owner of property described in this grant  
(landowner or organization)

application to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB). I am aware the project is being proposed on said property. My signature authorizes the applicant listed below to seek funding for project implementation, however, does not represent authorization of project implementation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Landowner Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

### Project Applicant Information

**Project Name:**

**Project Applicant Contact Information:**

☐ Mr.      ☐ Ms.      Title

First Name:      Last Name:

Contact Mailing Address:

Contact E-Mail Address:

Lead Entity Organization: